

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1, 4, and 6-17 are pending in the application. In the final Office Action dated March 17, 2010, the Examiner objected to claim 1. Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 6-9, 12, and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,280,527 ("Gullman") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,014,666 ("Helland") and rejected claims 10, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gullman in view of Helland and U.S. Pat. No. 5,805,719 ("Pare").

On May 17, 2010, Applicants filed a response to the final Office Action amending claim 1. In an Advisory Action dated June 4, 2010, the Examiner indicated that the amendments to claim 1 had been entered and the objection to claim 1 had been overcome. Additionally, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 1, 4, 6-9, 12, and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gullman in view of Helland and maintained the rejection of claims 10, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gullman in view of Helland and Pare.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 and added new claims 51-54.

II. Rejection of claims 1, 4, and 6-17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Amended independent claim 1 generally recites a removable storage device comprising a flash memory, a biometric interface, and a processor. The "biometric interface for receiving, independently of the host device, a request to access the flash memory at the removable storage device" and the "processor for managing access to the flash memory, independently of the host device, based on a comparison of the request to the at least one permission, the comparison being independent, requiring no management by an operating system of the host device, such that if the at least one permission includes a particular access type that matches the access requested in the request, the processor provides such access to the flash memory, and alternatively if the at least one permission does not include a particular access type that matches the access requested in the request, the processor denies such access to the flash

memory." The proposed combination of Gullman, Helland, and Pare fail to teach these elements.

Gullman is directed to a biometric token for authorizing access to a host system. Generally, Gullman teaches a security apparatus that receives a biometric input from a user and compares the received biometric input to a stored template. The security apparatus generates a token based on a determined correlation between the biometric input and the stored template, and provides the token to the user. The user then provides the generated token to a host system, which determines whether to grant the user access to the host system based on the received token.

Gullman does not teach a removable storage device comprising a biometric interface for receiving, independently of the host device, a request to access a flash memory at the removable storage device. Gullman also does not teach a removable storage device comprising a processor for managing access to the flash memory, independently of the host device, based on a comparison of the request to the at least one permission, the comparison being independent, requiring no management by an operating system of the host device, such that if the at least one permission includes a particular access type that matches the access requested in the request, the processor provides such access to the flash memory, and alternatively if the at least one permission does not include a particular access type that matches the access requested in the request, the processor denies such access to the flash memory. In Gullman, it is the **host system** that determines whether to grant a user access to the resources of the host system based on a received token rather than a processor of a **removable storage device** that independently manages an ability of a user access flash memory, requiring no management by an operating system of the host device as in claim 1.

Helland is directed to declarative and programmatic access control of component-based server application using roles. In the Office Action, the Examiner cites col. 5, line 55 – col. 6, line 5 and col. 6, lines 13-27 of Helland for teaching a universal serial bus, a USB controller, a flash memory, and a flash memory controller. Col. 5, line 55 – Col. 6, line 5 of Helland teach that a server may include components such as a hard drive, magnetic disk drive, optical drive, flash memory cards, and/or

Bernoulli cartridges that provide storage for the server. Col. 6, lines 13-27 of Helland teaches that a user may enter commands and other information into a server through devices such as a keyboard and mouse that communicate with the server over a universal serial bus.

As with Gullman, the cited portions of Helland fail to teach a removable storage device comprising a biometric interface for receiving, independently of the host device, a request to access a flash memory at the removable storage device. The cited portions of Helland additionally fail to teach a removable storage device comprising a processor for managing access to the flash memory, independently of the host device, based on a comparison of the request to the at least one permission, the comparison being independent, requiring no management by an operating system of the host device, such that if the at least one permission includes a particular access type that matches the access requested in the request, the processor provides such access to the flash memory, and alternatively if the at least one permission does not include a particular access type that matches the access requested in the request, the processor denies such access to the flash memory. Accordingly, in neither the cited portions of Gullman nor the cited portions of Helland is a processor of a removable storage device independently determining whether to grant a user access to flash memory of the storage device without management from a host device.

Gullman and Helland, alone or in combination, fail to teach a removable storage device comprising "a biometric interface for receiving, independently of the host device, a request to access the flash memory at the removable storage device." Similarly, Gullman and Helland, alone or in combination, fail to teach a removable storage device comprising "a processor for managing access to the flash memory, independently of the host device, based on a comparison of the request to the at least one permission, the comparison being independent, requiring no management by an operating system of the host device, such that if the at least one permission includes a particular access type that matches the access requested in the request, the processor provides such access to the flash memory, and alternatively if the at least one permission does not include a particular access type that matches the access requested in the request, the

processor denies such access to the flash memory." Pare is directed to tokenless identification of individuals and also does not teach these elements. For at least this reason, amended independent claim 1, and any claim that depends on claim 1, is patentable over the combinations of Gullman, Helland, and Pare contemplated by the Examiner.

III. Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims and the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott W. Brim/
Scott W. Brim
Registration No. 51,500
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200